UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,260	08/11/2006	Stephane V. Odent	08350.5368-01000	6054

58982 7590 08/16/2010

CATERPILLAR/FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, L.L.P.
901 New York Avenue, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER	
YUN, CARINA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/16/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/589,260	ODENT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CARINA YUN	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *June 23, 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,6,7,10-14,16 and 21-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,6,7,10-14,16 and 21-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *06/23/2010*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to applicant's amendments and/or remarks filed on June 23, 2010, claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-14, 16, and 21-29 are pending. Claims 4-5, 8-9, 15 and 17-20 have been cancelled.

Response to Amendment

2. The objection to the specification has been withdrawn in light of the newly filed abstract. The objection to the claims has been withdrawn in light of the corrections to the line indentations.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 21 depends on itself. Examiner is interpreting claim 21 to depend on claim 22. Applicant is strongly encouraged to fix this error and reorder the claims so the independent claim comes first. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohan et al. (FlexFlow: Workflow for Interactive Internet Applications) in view of Matsuba (Patent No. 6,467,078).

Regarding claim 1, Mohan teaches a device operating as a finite state machine and provided for processing events and actions relating to at least one object that changes between an initial and a final state (Mohan, Fig. 3 on pg. 3, and pg. 4 Flexflow system, the event is Offer and the action is record offer), said device comprising: an action dispatcher configured to receive the at least one determined action from the processing member, and perform an execution routine to execute the at least one determined action (Mohan, see Fig. 4, FlexFlow event handler and engine, note that in step 1, an incoming event is received, note step 6, the engine executes the action).

Mohan suggests but does not clearly disclose a state engine editor having an input for receiving object data identifying said object, said object data further comprising data relating to:

a first set of states including the initial state and the final state, a second set of events, and a third set of actions, said third set comprising data relating to at least one of a first sub-set of processing actions, a second sub-set of timed actions, or a third sub-set of transition actions, at least one of the time actions being initiated each time at least one of the processing actions of said first sub-set lapses after a predetermined time period; said state engine editor being configured to: form at least one event-state-action diagram defining the finite state machine, the at least one diagram being structured as a matrix of said states of said first set and said events of said second set in order to create at least one state-event combination in at least one position within said matrix, and associate at least one of said actions of said third set to the at least one state event combination; a memory having an input connected to the state engine editor and being configured to store the at least one diagram; a processing member connected to the memory, said processing member having an input and being configured to: receive at least one event messages via the input of the processing member; determine which of the second set is associated with the at least one received event-message, monitor an actual state of said object, the actual state being associated with one of the states of the first set, determine a position within the matrix of said diagram corresponding to said actual state and said determining event, and determine at least one action associated with the determined position.

However, Matsuba teaches a state engine editor having an input (inputting section, see col. 9, lines 24-32) for receiving object data identifying said object , said object data further comprising data relating to: a first set of states including the initial state and the final state, a second set of events, and a third set of actions (e.g. editor used to create and edit the state transition matrix based on a state, event, action, see Matsuba, col. 9, lines 1-14), said third set

comprising data relating to at least one of a first sub-set of processing actions (Matsuba, see Fig. 11, col. 28, lines 50-58, examiner notes the third subset consists of transitions action that is triggering a state change is a request from CPU to write magnetic data to the card shown in Fig. 11, (cell 1, 1)), a second sub-set of timed actions (see col. 29, lines 1-14, processing time required is 1ms), or a third sub-set of transition actions (see col. 29, lines 35-40, receiving a response that writing is complete), at least one of the time actions being initiated each time at least one of the processing actions of said first sub-set lapses after a predetermined time period (Matsuba, see col. 21, lines 50-57, StateChange represents how the object changes with the passage of time); said state engine editor being configured to: form at least one event-state-action diagram defining the finite state machine, the at least one diagram being structured as a matrix of said states of said first set and said events of said second set in order to create at least one state-event combination in at least one position within said matrix (Matsuba, see Fig. 3, Matrix, see col. 11, lines 66-67 to col.12, lines 1-14, examiner notes state 1, event 2, is represented by cell (1,2)), and associate at least one of said actions of said third set to the at least one state event combination (Matsuba, see Fig. 11, col. 28, lines 50-58, examiner notes the third subset consists of transitions action that is triggering a state change is a request from CPU to write magnetic data to the card shown in Fig. 11, (cell 1, 1)); a memory having an input connected to the state engine editor and being configured to store the at least one diagram (storing section of state transition matrix, see Matsuba, col. 9, lines 1-14); a processing member connected to the memory (see Fig 2, CPU 24 connected to RAM 25), said processing member having an input (see Fig. 2 CPU 24 and input port 27) and being configured to: receive at least one event messages via the input of the processing member (see col. 9, lines 36-39, inputting section to even or state code);

determine which of the second set is associated with the at least one received event-message (determine a corresponding cell based on an event corresponding to the even code, see col. 9, lines 40-50), monitor an actual state of said object, the actual state being associated with one of the states of the first set, determine a position within the matrix of said diagram corresponding to said actual state and said determining event (see col. 1, lines 30-37 real time control system, examiner notes since the matrix represents real time data, the diagram represents actual states) , and determine at least one action associated with the determined position (see col. 2, lines 59-67, indication position each corresponding to two or more events or states). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Regarding claim 2, Mohan suggests but does not clearly disclose wherein said state engine editor is configured to associate with each of the at least one state-event combination, an action selected from among said third sub-set. However, Matsuba teaches wherein said state engine editor is configured to associate with each of the at least one state-event combination, an action selected from among said third sub-set (Matsuba, see Fig. 11, col. 28, lines 50-58, examiner notes the third subset consists of transitions action that is triggering a state change is a request from CPU to write magnetic data to the card shown in Fig. 11, (cell 1, 1)). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Regarding claim 3, Mohan suggests but does not clearly disclose wherein said state engine editor is configured to associate with each of the at least one state-event combination, only actions belonging to said first or second sub-set. However, Matsuba teaches wherein said state engine editor is configured to associate with each of the at least one state-event combination, only actions belonging to said first or second sub-set (see Mohan, pg. 2, XML representation, examiner notes matrix includes final states and actions). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Regarding claim 6, Mohan teaches wherein the diagram is identified in the memory by a description thereof and a reference to the object to which the respective diagram belongs (see Mohan, pg. 2, XML representation).

Regarding claim 7, Mohan teaches wherein the data relating to each state includes a description thereof and a reference to the diagram to which the respective state belongs (see Mohan pg. 2, XML Representation State Identifier); and the data relating to each even includes a description thereof and a reference to the object to which the respective event belongs (see Mohan, pg. 2, XML representation).

Regarding claim 10, Mohan teaches wherein said state engine editor is configured to form the at least one diagram with an XML description (see Mohan, pg. 2, XML representation).

Regarding claim 11, Mohan suggests but does not clearly disclose wherein the data relating each transition action of said third sub-set comprises a reference to an event of said second set, a source and a target state as well as a reference to said diagram to which the

respective transition action belongs. However, Matsuba teaches wherein the data relating to each transition action of said third sub-set comprises a reference to an event of said second set, a source and a target state as well as a reference to said diagram to which the respective transition action belongs (Matsuba, see Fig. 7, examiner notes each event has a reference). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Regarding claim 12, Mohan suggests but does not clearly disclose wherein said first sub-set comprises a first class of generic actions and a second class of specific actions, an the data relating to each action of the first sub-set includes a reference to the object to which the respective action belongs. However, Matsuba teaches wherein said first sub-set comprises a first class of generic actions and a second class of specific actions, an the data relating to each action of the first sub-set includes a reference to the object to which the respective action belongs (Matsuba, see Fig. 7, examiner notes each action has a reference). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Regarding claim 13, Mohan teaches a method for processing, within a finite state machine, events and actions relating to at least one object that changes between an initial and a final state (Mohan, Fig. 3 on pg. 3, and pg. 4 Flexflow system, the event is Offer and the action is record offer), wherein said method comprises: receiving object data identifying said at least one object and said initial and final state (Mohan, See Fig. 3, pg. 3, initial state is start, final state is

deal); determining said at least one object associated with said at least one received event-message (Mohan, see Fig. 4, pg. 5, examiner notes the engine monitors the incoming events, and looks for transition of state); monitoring an actual state for said determined object; and determining, upon receipt of the at least one event-message, (Mohan, see Fig. 4, pg. 5, examiner notes the engine monitors the incoming events, and looks for transition of state); and executing said determined action by processing an execution routine provided for controlling said execution of said determined action (Mohan, see Fig. 4, FlexFlow event handler and engine, note that in step 1, an incoming event is received, note step 6, the engine executes the action).

Mohan suggests but does not clearly disclose determining at least one action associated with the determined position; said object data comprising a first set of states, a second set of events and a third set of actions, said third set comprising a first sub-set of processing actions, a second sub-set of timed actions provided to initiate each time at least one predetermined action of said first sub-set has lapsed after a predetermined time period has lapsed and a third sub-set of transition actions; forming at least one event-state-action diagram defined in a final state machine pattern of said finite state machine by structuring said states of said first set and said events of said second set as a matrix in order to create at positions within said matrix, each time, a state-event combination; associating with at least one state-event combination at least one of said actions of said third set; receiving at least one event-message relating to said at least one object; determining which of the events of the second set is associated with the at least one received event-message; a position within the matrix of said diagram corresponding to said actual state and said event.

However, Matsuba teaches determining at least one action associated with the determined position (see col. 2, lines 59-67, indication position each corresponding to two or more events or states); said object data comprising a first set of states, a second set of events and a third set of actions (Matsuba, col. 18, lines 27-35, data consisting of state, events, action), said third set comprising a first sub-set has lapsed of processing actions, a second sub-set of timed actions provided to initiate each time at least one predetermined action of said first sub-set after a predetermined time period has lapsed and a third sub-set of transition actions (Matsuba, see Fig. 11, col. 28, lines 50-58, examiner notes the third subset consists of transitions action that is triggering a state change is a request from CPU to write magnetic data to the card shown in Fig. 11, (cell 1, 1)); forming at least one event-state-action diagram defined in a final state machine pattern of said finite state machine by structuring said states of said first set and said events of said second set as a matrix in order to create at least one state-event combination in at least one position within said matrix, the diagram including initial and final states (Matsuba, see Fig. 3, Matrix, see col. 11, lines 66-67 to col.12, lines 1-14, examiner notes state 1, event 2, is represented by cell (1,2)); associating with at least one state-event combination at least one of said actions of said third set (Matsuba, see Fig. 11, col. 28, lines 50-58, examiner notes the third subset consists of transitions action that is triggering a state change is a request from CPU to write magnetic data to the card shown in Fig. 11, (cell 1, 1)); receiving at least one event-messages relating to said at least one object (see col. 9, lines 36-39, inputting section to even or state code); determining which of the events of the second set is associated with the at least one received event-message into one of said events of said second set (determine a corresponding cell based on an event corresponding to the even code, see col. 9, lines 40-50); a position within

the matrix of said diagram corresponding to said actual state and said event (Matsuba, see col. 9, lines 24-30). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Regarding claim 14, Mohan teaches wherein: said at least one object includes a plurality of objects, classified by object types (see Fig. 3, pg. 3, 2 objects, classified as buyer and seller) the object data identifying the plurality of objects including a definition and a description of the object type to which the respective object belongs (see Mohan, pg. 2, see XML representation which has definition and description of objects), and a plurality of event-state-action diagrams are formed for each of the objects, each of the diagrams corresponding to one of said object types (see state diagram in Visual Modeling tool, Fig. 1), said monitoring further comprising a selection of at least one of said diagrams based on said object type (Mohan, see Fig. 4, pg. 5, examiner notes the engine monitors the incoming events, and looks for transition of state).

Regarding claim 16, Mohan teaches wherein said at least one object includes a plurality of objects (see Fig. 3, pg. 3, 2 objects, classified as buyer and seller), and for each of the plurality of objects, at least one dedicated event-state-action diagram is formed (see Mohan see Fig. 2, event, state, action, diagram), said event-messages comprising an object identifier (see Mohan, pg. 2, see XML representation which has definition and description of objects), said monitoring further comprising a selection of at least one of said diagrams based on said identified object (Mohan, see Fig. 4, pg. 5, examiner notes the engine monitors the incoming events, and looks for transition of state).

7. Claims 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadaba (US Patent No. 6,889,194) in view of Matsuba (Patent No. 6,467,078) and Mohan et al. (FlexFlow: Workflow for Interactive Internet Applications).

Regarding claim 22, Kadaba teaches a system for monitoring and controlling delivery of a package (see col. 2, lines 24-30 delivery information of parcel), the system comprising: a memory configured to store package data identifying the package (see col. 5, lines 4-6, Flash RAM device capable of storing information about the parcel), the package data comprising data relating to a first set of states including an initial state and a final state of the package during a package delivery (see Fig. 5A depiction of states relating to package delivery), a second set of events (see Fig. 5A Exit Selected, note this is an event), and a third set of actions (see Fig. 5A Erase Parcel Record, note this is an action), the package data incorporated into an event-state-action diagram (see Fig. 5A, state and event action diagram showing steps for shipping a package).

Kadaba does not clearly disclose the diagram being structured as a matrix of the states of the first set and the events of the second set to form a plurality of state-event combinations, the diagram associating at least one of the actions of the third set to at least one of the state-event combinations; a processing member connected to the memory, the processing member having an input and being configured to: receive at least one event-message via the input of the processing member, determine which of the events of the second set is associated with the at least one received event-message, monitor an actual state of the package, the actual state being associated with one of the states of the first set, and determine, using the stored diagram and based on the

determined event and the actual state of the package, which of the actions of the third set to perform.

However, Matsuba teaches the diagram being structured as a matrix of the states of the first set and the events of the second set to form a plurality of state-event combinations (Matsuba, col. 18, lines 27-35, data consisting of state, events, action), the diagram associating at least one of the actions of the third set to at least one of the state-event combinations (Matsuba, see Fig. 11, col. 28, lines 50-58, examiner notes the third subset consists of transitions action that is triggering a state change is a request from CPU to write magnetic data to the card shown in Fig. 11, (cell 1, 1)); a processing member connected to the memory(see Fig 2, CPU 24 connected to RAM 25), the processing member having an input and being configured to: receive at least one event-message via the input of the processing member(see Fig. 2 CPU 24 and input port 27), determine which of the events of the second set is associated with the at least one received event-message(determine a corresponding cell based on an event corresponding to the even code, see col. 9, lines 40-50), monitor an actual state of the package, the actual state being associated with one of the states of the first set(see col. 1, lines 30-37 real time control system, examiner notes since the matrix represents real time data, the diagram represents actual states), and determine, using the stored diagram and based on the determined event and the actual state of the package, which of the actions of the third set to perform (see col. 9, lines 41-50). Hence, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Kadaba and Matsuba to monitor and control states in real time.

Kadaba and Matsuba do not clearly disclose an action dispatcher configured to receive the at least one determined action from the processing member and perform an execution routine

to execute the at least one determined action. However Mohan teaches an action dispatcher configured to receive the at least one determined action from the processing member and perform an execution routine to execute the at least one determined action (Mohan, see Fig. 4, FlexFlow event handler and engine, note that in step 1, an incoming event is received, note step 6, the engine executes the action). Hence, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Kadaba, Matsuba and Mohan to model business processes effectively.

Regarding claim 23, Kadaba teaches wherein the event-message is received from a shipping application used in a warehouse (see col. 6, lines 32-38, customer server relays shipping record to the mainframe to update the tracking database, examiner notes the event-message is obvious in this disclosure as the message information is relayed), a scanner used in the warehouse, a scanner used by a courier driver, a scanner used at a drop-off location, or a timer trigger.

Regarding claim 24, Kadaba teaches wherein the initial state relates to a source of the package, and the final state relates to a final destination for the package (see col. 11, lines 56-67 and col. 12, lines 1-5).

Regarding claim 25, Kadaba teaches wherein the actual state of the package is determined independently from data stored in the diagram (see col. 11, lines 30-42, note the actual state is determined by the computer system and not the data stored in the diagram).

Regarding claim 26, Kadaba teaches wherein the action dispatcher is capable of performing different actions to transition the package from a first state to a second state (see Fig. 8, the depicted actions are sort by company, transmit request).

Regarding claim 27, Kadaba teaches wherein the processing member is configured to select, based on the actual state of the package and the determined event, which of the different actions to perform to transition the package from the first state to the second state (see col. 10, lines 48-54).

Regarding claim 28, Kadaba teaches wherein, when the actual state of the package is a first state, the action dispatcher is capable of performing different actions to either transition the package to a second state or to a third state (see Fig. 8, tracking menu can transition to data entry state or number entry state).

Regarding claim 29, Kadaba teaches wherein the processing member is configured to select, based on the actual state of the package and the determined event, which of the different actions to perform to transition the package from the first state to either the second state or the third state (see Fig. 8, tracking menu can transition to data entry state or number entry state).

Regarding claim 21, Kadaba and Mohan do not clearly disclose wherein the processing member determines the at least one action associated with the determined position independent of information from any other position in the matrix. However, Matsuba teaches wherein the processing member determines the at least one action associated with the determined position independent of information from any other position in the matrix (see col. 9, lines 36-41). Hence, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Kadaba, Matsuba and Mohan to model business processes effectively.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed on June 23, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In reply to Applicant's remarks on page 14, with regard to 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections, Applicant argues: a) the cited references do not disclose or suggest a processing member "configured to monitor an actual state of said object… [and] determine a position within the matrix of said diagram corresponding to said actual state and said determined event". Applicant states that Matsuba rather discloses the state based on information stored in the state transition matrix. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Matsuba teaches monitoring an actual state of the object by disclosing a real time control system having a state transition matrix. In this case, the state transition matrix monitors the state as the system detects the destination of positions corresponding to the states and events (see col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 2, lines 59-61 and col. 1, lines 30-37). Matsuba teaches determine a position within the matrix of the diagram corresponding to the actual state and determined event by disclosing the state transition matrix and inputting positional information that indicates positions where the event or state corresponds (see col. 2, lines 59-65). Since, the system is designed for a real time, the state of the cell in the matrix is the actual state or a real time state. Therefore, Matsuba teaches monitoring of an actual state.

Examiner Notes

9. Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially

teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Support for Amendments and Newly Added Claims

10. Applicants are respectfully requested, in the event of an amendment to claims or submission of new claims, that such claims and their limitations be directly mapped to the specification, which provides support for the subject matter. This will assist in expediting compact prosecution. MPEP 714.02 recites: "Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP § 2163.06. An amendment which does not comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.121(b), (c), (d), and (h) may be held not fully responsive. See MPEP § 714." **Amendments not pointing to specific support in the disclosure may be deemed as not complying with provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.131(b), (c), (d), and (h) and therefore held not fully responsive.** Generic statements such as "Applicants believe no new matter has been introduced" may be deemed insufficient.

Interview Requests

11. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.133(a)(3), requests for interview must be made in advance. Interview requests are to be made by telephone (571-270-7848) call or FAX (571-270-8848). Applicants must provide a detailed agenda as to what will be discussed (generic statement such as "discuss §102 rejection" or "discuss rejections of claims 1-3" may be denied interview). The detail agenda along with any proposed amendments is to be written on a PTOL-413A or a custom form and should be faxed (or emailed, subject to MPEP 713.01.I / MPEP 502.03) to the Examiner at least 3 days prior to the scheduled interview.

Interview requests submitted within amendments may be denied because the Examiner was not notified, in advance, of the Applicant Initiated Interview Request and due to time constraints may not be able to review the interview request to prior to the mailing of the next Office Action.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CARINA YUN whose telephone number is (571)270-7848. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 9.30am-6.30pm; alt. Fri, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, SAM SOUGH can be reached on (571)272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. Y./
Examiner, Art Unit 2194

/Hyung S. SOUGH/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2194
August 12, 2010